

Visitors' report

| | |
|---|--|
| Name of education provider | Canterbury Christ Church University |
| Programme name | FD Health and Social Care (Paramedic Practice) |
| Mode of delivery | Full time Work based learning |
| Relevant part of the HCPC Register | Paramedic |
| Date of visit | 12 – 13 May 2015 |

Contents

| | |
|---------------------------|---|
| Executive summary | 2 |
| Introduction..... | 3 |
| Visit details | 3 |
| Sources of evidence | 4 |
| Recommended outcome | 5 |
| Conditions..... | 6 |

Executive summary

The Health and Care Professions Council (HCPC) approve educational programmes in the UK which health and care professionals must complete before they can apply to be registered with us. We are a statutory regulator and our main aim is to protect the public. We currently regulate 16 professions. All of these professions have at least one professional title which is protected by law. This means that anyone using the title 'paramedic' must be registered with us. The HCPC keep a register of health and care professionals who meet our standards for their training, professional skills, behaviour and health.

The visitors' report which follows outlines the recommended outcome made by the visitors on the approval of the programme. This recommended outcome was accepted by the Education and Training Committee (Committee) on 30 June 2015. At this meeting, the programme was approved. This means that the education provider has met the condition(s) outlined in this report and that the programme meets our standards of education and training (SETs) and ensures that those who complete it meet our standards of proficiency (SOPs) for their part of the Register. The programme is now granted open ended approval, subject to satisfactory monitoring.

Introduction

The HCPC visited the programme at the education provider as it was a new programme which was seeking HCPC approval for the first time. This visit assessed the programme against the standards of education and training (SETs) and considered whether those who complete the programme meet the standards of proficiency (SOPs) for their part of the Register.

This visit was an HCPC only visit. The education did not validate or review the programme at the visit and the professional body did not consider their accreditation of the programme. The education provider supplied an independent chair and secretary for the visit.

Visit details

| | |
|---|---|
| Name and role of HCPC visitors | Paul Bates (Paramedic) Sue Boardman (Paramedic) Joanne Watchman (Lay visitor) |
| HCPC executive officer (in attendance) | Alex Urquhart |
| Proposed student numbers | 15 per cohort, two cohorts per year |
| Proposed start date of programme approval | 1 September 2015 |
| Chair | Ian Felstead (Canterbury Christ Church University) |
| Secretary | Lauren Smyth (Canterbury Christ Church University) |

Sources of evidence

Prior to the visit the HCPC reviewed the documentation detailed below, sent by the education provider:

| | Yes | No | N/A |
|--|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| Programme specification | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| Descriptions of the modules | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| Mapping document providing evidence of how the education provider has met the SETs | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| Mapping document providing evidence of how the education provider has met the SOPs | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| Practice placement handbook | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| Student handbook | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| Curriculum vitae for relevant staff | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| External examiners' reports from the last two years | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |

The HCPC did not review the external examiner reports' from the last two years prior to the visit as there is currently no external examiner as the programme is new.

During the visit the HCPC saw the following groups or facilities:

| | Yes | No | N/A |
|---|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|
| Senior managers of the education provider with responsibility for resources for the programme | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| Programme team | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| Placements providers and educators / mentors | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| Students | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| Service users and carers | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| Learning resources | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| Specialist teaching accommodation (eg specialist laboratories and teaching rooms) | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |

The HCPC met with students from the BSc (Hons) Paramedic Practice and FD Health and Social Care programme, as the programme seeking approval currently does not have any students enrolled on it.

Recommended outcome

To recommend a programme for approval, the visitors must be satisfied that the programme meets all of the standards of education and training (SETs) and that those who complete the programme meet our standards of proficiency (SOPs) for the relevant part of the Register.

The visitors agreed to recommend to the Education and Training Committee that a number of conditions are set on the programme, all of which must be met before the programme can be approved.

The visitors agreed that 55 of the SETs have been met and that conditions should be set on the remaining three SETs.

Conditions are requirements that the education provider must meet before the programme can be approved. Conditions are set when certain standards of education and training have not been met or there is insufficient evidence of the standard being met.

The visitors did not make any recommendations for the programme.

Recommendations are observations on the programme or education provider which do not need to be met before the programme can be approved. Recommendations are made to encourage further enhancements to the programme, normally when it is felt that the particular standard of education and training has been met at, or just above the threshold level.

Conditions

2.3 The admissions procedures must apply selection and entry criteria, including criminal convictions checks.

Condition: The education provider must revise the selection and entry criteria, including criminal conviction checks ensuring that the applicant is required to provide an up to date criminal conviction check when they apply for the programme.

Reason: For this standard, the documentation stated that as the applicants will be employed by South East Coast Ambulance Service NHS Foundation Trust (SECAMB) they will have a DBS check carried out by the employer. However, the visitors noted that when students will go on placement in a setting that is not with their current employer, the DBS check may not be current or applicable. The visitors noted that it is the responsibility of the education provider to run appropriate and relevant criminal conviction checks prior to their enrolment on the programme. Therefore the education provider must ensure that applicants demonstrate that they have a current criminal conviction check when they enter the programme.

2.4 The admissions procedures must apply selection and entry criteria, including compliance with any health requirements.

Condition: The education provider must revise the entry requirements ensuring that applicants must adhere to any relevant health checks when they apply to the programme.

Reason: For this standard, the documentation stated that as the applicants will be employed by SECAMB they would have met any relevant occupational health clearance in line with the requirements for employment with SECAMB. However the visitors noted that the health checks for working in an Ambulance service may not be relevant for other non-ambulance placements such as an operating department. The visitors also noted that there was a potential risk to potential students when they are on placement if they do not have the relevant occupational health clearance. The visitors further noted that it is the responsibility of the education provider to ensure that applicants and potential students adhere to any relevant health check and have occupational health clearance. Therefore the education provider is required to ensure that any applicant and potential student adheres to any relevant health checks and occupational health clearance for the current range of placements as defined by the education provider.

6.7 Assessment regulations must clearly specify requirements for student progression and achievement within the programme.

Condition: The education provider is required to revise the documentation available to students and the assessment regulations so that they clearly outline the requirements for student progression and achievement within the programme

Reason: For this standard, the visitors were directed to the 'programme conventions' in the programme specification document on page 155 where there is a link to the education providers general academic conventions, therefore the visitors were unable to make a decision if the requirements for student progression for this programme were clear to students.. During the meeting with the programme team it was made clear that

modules are split between academic and practical assessment and that students must pass both parts of all modules in order to progress through the next level. It was also stated that students can only retake a module assessment once, and that if they are unable to pass the retake they are not allowed to progress on the programme. The visitors noted that this information is crucial to students on the programme and that this should be made explicit to students. Therefore the education provider must revise the documentation available to students and the assessment regulations so that they clearly outline the requirements for student progression and achievement within the programme.

Paul Bates
Sue Boardman
Joanne Watchman